

LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING AND ITS PEDAGOGICAL AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS

Alla Nypadymka

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Modern European Languages,
State University of Trade and Economics, Ukraine
e-mail: a.nypadymka@knute.edu.ua, orcid.org/0000-0003-3267-6323

Summary

This study investigates the use of large language models (LLMs) by university students in foreign language learning, analysing usage patterns, perceived benefits and limitations, cognitive effects, and academic integrity awareness. A survey of 398 students at the State University of Trade and Economics revealed that 84% actively use LLMs, primarily for information retrieval, translation verification, and text editing rather than conversational practice. While students report reduced anxiety and improved access to learning support, concerning trends emerge: over half experience at least occasional emotional dependence on AI, and significant proportions report declining memorisation abilities and reduced speaking confidence. Students prioritise efficiency-oriented benefits over language-specific affordances, a pattern partly attributable to the challenging learning conditions caused by Russia's ongoing war of aggression against Ukraine. Notably, the overwhelming majority of students believe that LLM use should be regulated rather than forbidden, reflecting a broad recognition that these tools require structured institutional frameworks to be used responsibly and effectively. The findings underscore the need for clear ethical guidelines, responsible integration strategies, and assessment approaches that ensure LLMs enhance rather than replace the development of genuine language competencies.

Key words: artificial intelligence, EFL learners, academic integrity, language acquisition, AI dependency, ChatGPT, higher education, communicative competence.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/7420>

1. Introduction

The Large Language Model became widely available to the general public in 2023, when ChatGPT created a real sensation among users worldwide. Students and educators quickly discovered that this chat tool not only conducted natural conversations, but could also answer questions, search for information, write essays and letters, and translate texts into any language. Since then, universities have faced a new challenge: students began completing their assignments using these language models, often without critically evaluating the correctness of the answers or the quality of their work. This shift in learning practices has raised important questions about academic integrity, cognitive development, and the role of technology in language education.

There is no single definition of artificial intelligence, because its tools are capable of performing a wide range of tasks and producing various types of outputs. According to the Encyclopædia Britannica, AI is the ability of a digital computer or computer-controlled robot to perform tasks commonly associated with intelligent beings (*Copeland, 2026*). The Cambridge

Dictionary defines AI as “the use or study of computer systems or machines that have some of the qualities that the human brain has, such as the ability to interpret and produce language in a way that seems human, recognise or create images, solve problems, and learn from data supplied to them” (Cambridge, 2026). The same dictionary characterises a large language model as “a complex mathematical representation of language that is based on very large amounts of data and allows computers to produce language that seems similar to what a human might say” (Cambridge, 2026).

In our research, we distinguish between artificial intelligence (AI) and large language models (LLM). AI is a broad field encompassing many technologies, while LLM represents a specific application focused on language processing. While AI includes various technologies such as computer vision, robotics, and recommendation systems, a large language model (LLM) is specifically designed to understand and generate human language based on patterns learned from vast amounts of text. Well-known examples of LLMs include GPT-4, Claude 4.5, and Gemini. These tools have become particularly relevant for foreign language learners, as they offer immediate feedback, translation assistance, and conversational practice opportunities that were previously unavailable or limited.

The phrase “students are exposed to a vast amount of information during their studies” has become not only a cliché in recent years but also a defining characteristic of modern education. However, with the integration of LLMs into learning processes, this information overload has taken on new dimensions. Teachers and researchers around the world, closely monitoring the development of these technologies and their implementation in education, recognise both the opportunities and the challenges they present. The concerns are multifaceted and growing. One of the primary questions educators now face is whether student work was completed independently or with the assistance of LLMs. Beyond this fundamental issue of academic integrity, educators are also questioning whether students are developing critical thinking skills or merely learning to prompt AI effectively. There is concern about the potential decline in students’ writing abilities, as they may rely on LLMs to generate rather than compose texts. Additionally, teachers wonder if students are retaining information when they can instantly retrieve it through AI tools, and whether the dependency on LLMs might hinder the development of problem-solving skills essential for independent learning. The psychological dimension is equally troubling: are students becoming emotionally dependent on these tools, and does this reliance affect their academic confidence and motivation? Furthermore, in the context of foreign language learning, a critical question emerges: are students actually acquiring language proficiency, or are they simply learning to use translation and text generation tools as a crutch?

These concerns have prompted educators and researchers to examine the impact of LLM use on student learning outcomes, cognitive development, and academic performance, particularly in the domain of foreign language acquisition.

2. Theoretical Background and Literature Review

Research on LLM integration in foreign language learning has gained momentum in recent years, with scholars examining both the pedagogical opportunities and challenges these technologies present.

M. Bagni analysed the linguistic characteristics of student essays and LLM-generated texts through metadiscourse analysis. The study found that most student submissions exhibited hybrid characteristics, combining authentic and AI-generated content. Students with limited

writing proficiency relied more heavily on LLMs and particularly struggled to establish reader engagement through interactional metadiscourse, features that AI tools fail to replicate effectively. M. Bagni argues that “the application of critical thinking remains essential for using these tools effectively and responsibly in academic settings” (Bagni, 2025: 137).

A. Zhang and C. Jiang examined the impact of LLM-assisted writing instruction on self-regulated learning strategies among Chinese EFL learners. Their findings indicate that this approach effectively promotes students’ cognitive engagement, metacognitive planning, and motivational regulation in writing tasks. However, students consistently emphasised the irreplaceable role of teacher guidance, particularly in areas requiring contextual judgment and personalised feedback. The researchers argue that teachers should guide students to critically evaluate LLM-generated feedback and help them learn when and how to apply suggestions strategically (Zhang, Jiang, 2026: 12).

This guidance is particularly crucial given the dual nature of LLMs in language learning. While these tools offer valuable support – explaining grammar rules, providing feedback, and generating essay outlines – their very convenience and accessibility can encourage students to delegate entire writing tasks to AI rather than engaging in the composition process themselves. The uncritical copying of AI-generated content may ultimately undermine students’ confidence in their own writing abilities (Wu, 2024: 530).

It should be noted that essay quality does not impact the consistency of either AI-generated or student-provided feedback, suggesting that both sources maintain reliable feedback standards regardless of writing proficiency level (Banihashem *et al.*, 2024). However, EFL writing performance can be significantly improved when students perceive AI technologies as interesting, effective, supportive, and goal-oriented, as demonstrated by the positive outcomes with Writerly and Google Docs (Wale, Kassahun, 2024).

While research on LLM integration in higher education has explored broad pedagogical opportunities and challenges, less attention has been given to their impact on specific language skills. Beyond writing instruction, reading comprehension presents equally important considerations. The need for clear guidelines and institutional preparedness in LLM integration has become evident across both writing and reading instruction (Barrett, Pack, 2023). Understanding how students use LLMs in reading contexts is particularly important, as independent text engagement develops essential competencies: reading literacy (comprehension, analysis, information retrieval) and cognitive abilities (attention, memory, logical thinking). Whether students turn to LLMs due to limited proficiency, lack of confidence, or other reasons, such delegation undermines the learning processes that reading assignments are designed to foster.

However, LLMs can effectively aid reading instruction and promote reading culture among EFL students when integrated through structured pedagogical frameworks, as demonstrated by positive teacher perceptions of AI-driven Differentiated Reading Circles (Dahia *et al.*, 2026). Yet, the effectiveness of LLM use in reading contexts depends significantly on how these tools are combined with traditional learning activities. Research indicates that while students value LLMs for making complex material more accessible and reducing cognitive load, combining LLM use with traditional note-taking produces superior outcomes in reading comprehension and retention compared to using LLMs alone (Kreijkes *et al.*, 2026). This suggests that LLMs should not replace but rather complement established learning practices, as note-taking promotes deeper cognitive engagement and aids memory, whereas LLMs primarily facilitate initial understanding and student interest. The combined approach maximises the benefits of both methods while maintaining the cognitive engagement essential for meaningful learning (Kreijkes *et al.*, 2026). Recent systematic reviews corroborate these findings,

demonstrating that ChatGPT's pedagogical value across language skills is optimised through integration with traditional teaching methods (*Aljohani, 2026*).

The promising pedagogical applications of LLMs in language learning must be balanced against significant ethical and academic integrity concerns that have sparked considerable debate in educational contexts. Central to these concerns is academic dishonesty, as educators fear that students may use ChatGPT for cheating or to complete assignments without genuine cognitive engagement (*Kohnke et al., 2023*). The issue is compounded by ChatGPT's failure to provide sources or citations for its responses, raising questions about plagiarism, as the tool essentially paraphrases unattributed sources, potentially violating academic integrity standards (*Kohnke et al., 2023*). A second critical challenge involves accuracy: while ChatGPT's responses sound authoritative and definitive, they may contain factual errors that users – particularly less experienced learners – may accept uncritically due to the absence of hedging or uncertainty markers (*Kohnke et al., 2023*). Research across diverse academic disciplines confirms that nearly half of students express reservations about the reliability of AI-generated content, alongside concerns that over-dependence on technology may erode critical thinking and independent problem-solving capacities (*Vieriu, Petrea, 2025*). Cultural bias embedded in ChatGPT's training data, which predominantly derives from English corpora, poses particular concerns for language learners from diverse backgrounds who may be unaware that AI outputs are not culturally neutral (*Kohnke et al., 2023*).

Beyond these operational concerns, a comprehensive ethical framework for LLMs in education must address fundamental human rights principles. W. Holmes and I. Tuomi argue that educational AI ethics cannot be reduced to questions of data and computation alone but must encompass broader dimensions including pedagogy, assessment, knowledge construction, and learner agency (*Holmes, Tuomi, 2022*). A rights-based approach suggests that students should maintain the right to autonomy – including the choice not to engage with AI systems without negatively affecting their education – and the right to human dignity, ensuring that teaching and assessment are not entirely delegated to AI systems (*Liu, 2023*). Data privacy emerges as another critical issue, particularly when students share personal or academic information with commercial AI platforms without understanding how their data may be used or stored (*Liu, 2023*). In language learning specifically, these concerns are amplified by the ease with which LLMs can generate translations, essays, or responses that may appear authentic but bypass the cognitive processes essential for genuine language acquisition.

These ethical challenges have prompted strong institutional reactions, including bans on ChatGPT access in some school systems and returns to traditional pen-and-paper assessment methods (*Kohnke et al., 2023; Vieriu, Petrea, 2025*). Importantly, research on AI chatbots in language learning demonstrates that even when technology proves pedagogically effective, students recognise that human instruction remains essential and that specific teacher guidance on accuracy problems should complement AI-based practice (*Ye et al., 2022*). This finding underscores a critical principle: ethical AI integration in education must ensure that technology augments rather than replaces the irreplaceable elements of human teaching, including nuanced feedback, motivational support, and pedagogical expertise that responds to individual learning contexts.

3. Research Aims and Methodology

The purpose of this article is to investigate the use of large language models by university students for learning foreign languages, in particular to analyse the frequency, purposes, and patterns of LLM use, and to assess their impact on the development of language competencies

(translation skills, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary development, speaking skills, understanding of cultural context). Additionally, this study aims to investigate the pedagogical implications of LLM integration, including changes in critical thinking, memory retention, writing skills, and learning autonomy, and to assess students' awareness of academic integrity principles and institutional policies regarding the ethical use of artificial intelligence in education.

4. Results and Discussion

To achieve this, we surveyed students at the State University of Trade and Economics using Google Forms. A total of 398 respondents participated in the 2025 survey. The majority were 18 years old (41.6%), followed by 19 (26.7%), with smaller proportions aged 17 (18.3%), 20 (8.9%), 21 (1.5%), and 22+ (3%). Gender distribution showed 66.3% female and 33.7% male respondents from various university faculties.

The 16-question survey employed skip logic: respondents not using LLMs for language learning (15.3%) exited after Question 1, while LLM users (84%) completed the full questionnaire. Questions addressed usage patterns (frequency, duration, purposes), verification practices, perceived benefits and limitations, cognitive effects, academic integrity awareness, and institutional policy knowledge. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages).

The survey revealed widespread integration of LLMs in foreign language learning, with 84% of respondents ($n=334$) actively using these technologies, while 15.3% reported no LLM use in their language studies. This high adoption rate aligns with recent systematic reviews documenting the rapid integration of ChatGPT and similar tools across educational contexts, where usage rates among students frequently exceed 80% (Aljohani, 2026; Vieriu, Petrea, 2025). Among LLM users, duration of engagement revealed substantial variation. The largest cohort (43.3%) reported 1-2 years of experience, followed by those using LLMs for more than 2 years (25.7%), 6-12 months (20.5%), and less than 6 months (10.5%). This distribution suggests that students rapidly adapted these technologies to their learning needs following the public release of advanced conversational AI tools in late 2022.

Regarding the frequency of LLM use in foreign language learning, the majority of respondents (45.6%) reported using these technologies 2-3 times per week, representing the modal category. Daily use was reported by 25.1% of students, while 14.6% used LLMs once a week, and another 14.6% only a couple of times per month. This distribution reveals that for 70.7% of users, LLM engagement occurs at least weekly, indicating that these technologies have become regular rather than occasional learning tools.

When asked about their purposes for using LLMs in foreign language learning (with multiple selections permitted), respondents identified diverse applications. The most common purpose was to find information or resources (79.5%), followed by translating or checking translations (65.5%), and generating ideas (58.5%). Over half (52.6%) used LLMs to find mistakes or reformat text, while 45.9% sought grammar explanations and 43.3% used them to solve complex problems. The least common purpose was practising conversation or dialogue (40.6%).

This pattern reveals that students primarily employ LLMs for support functions – locating resources, verifying translations, and checking accuracy – rather than for interactive practice. The dominance of information retrieval (79.5%) and translation verification (65.5%) indicates that LLMs serve primarily as on-demand reference tools. The relatively modest engagement with conversational practice (40.6%) is noteworthy, as interactive dialogue represents one

of the most distinctive affordances of AI chatbots for language learning (Kohnke et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2022), suggesting either limited awareness of this capability or preference for human interaction in developing speaking skills.

Regarding verification of LLM outputs, 43.2% of respondents reported always checking AI-generated responses, while 45.6% verified selectively depending on task importance. Only 9.9% rarely checked LLM outputs, and a minimal 1.3% expressed complete trust without verification. This indicates that 88.8% of students maintain critical engagement with AI-generated content, either consistently or situationally, suggesting awareness of potential accuracy issues (Kohnke et al., 2023; Vieriu, Petrea, 2025).

When asked whether they constantly need AI confirmation even for simple language tasks, 12.9% responded affirmatively, while 48.5% reported occasional dependency and 38.6% indicated no such need. The finding that 61.4% experience at least occasional reliance on AI verification for straightforward tasks reveals a potential shift in learning autonomy. This pattern may reflect either strategic use of AI as a confidence-building tool or emerging dependency that could undermine independent language processing skills.

When asked to identify the single most important benefit of LLMs for their foreign language learning, respondents' preferences revealed a clear hierarchy. Nearly half (45.6%) selected the ability to analyse large amounts of information, while a quarter (25.1%) valued the reduction of mechanical work and increased free time. These two efficiency-oriented benefits accounted for 70.7% of responses. In contrast, language-specific affordances received markedly lower recognition: understanding cultural context and nuances (10%), practising language skills anytime (8.2%), and receiving instant feedback on language errors (5.8%). The remaining 5.3% selected performing calculations without mistakes.

The dominance of efficiency-oriented benefits over language-specific capabilities presents a noteworthy pattern. Despite extensive research documenting that instant feedback and conversational practice represent distinctive pedagogical affordances of AI chatbots for language learning (Kohnke et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2022), students prioritise LLMs primarily as time-saving information processing tools rather than as interactive language partners. This finding suggests either that students have not fully explored LLMs' language-specific capabilities, or that their immediate pragmatic needs take precedence over engaging with specific language learning features.

When asked to identify the single most significant disadvantage of LLMs for foreign language learning, respondents' concerns clustered around two primary issues. Nearly a quarter (24.6%) identified AI-generated misinformation or incorrect translations as the most serious limitation, while an almost identical proportion (23.9%) worried that habitual AI use may not lead to genuine language proficiency. These two concerns accounted for 48.5% of responses, highlighting a tension between immediate utility and long-term learning outcomes.

The remaining concerns were more evenly distributed: reduced independent writing practice (14%), concern that work is not entirely one's own due to AI influence (13.5%), feelings of AI addiction (12.3%), deteriorating vocabulary and grammar memory (6.4%), and worry that AI can produce superior language output (5.3%).

The near-equal weighting of accuracy concerns (24.6%) and authentic proficiency concerns (23.9%) reflects the dual challenges identified in recent research: LLMs' documented tendency to generate authoritative-sounding but potentially erroneous content (Kohnke et al., 2023), and the risk that over-reliance on AI may bypass the cognitive processes essential for genuine language acquisition (Wu, 2024). The finding that nearly half of students identify these as primary concerns suggests widespread awareness of LLMs' fundamental limitations,

despite their high adoption rate (84%). This critical awareness, however, has not translated into rejection of these technologies, indicating that students perceive the benefits as outweighing the risks or feel they lack viable alternatives for managing their academic workload.

Regarding changes in anxiety levels since beginning LLM use, the majority of respondents (45%) reported no change, while 43.9% experienced decreased anxiety (16.4% significantly, 27.5% somewhat). Only 11.1% reported increased anxiety (8.8% somewhat, 2.3% significantly).

The finding that nearly half of students report reduced anxiety suggests that LLM access may provide psychological support in managing foreign language tasks, potentially lowering barriers to engagement. However, the 45% reporting no change indicates that for many students, LLMs neither alleviate nor exacerbate existing task-related stress. The minimal proportion experiencing increased anxiety (11.1%) suggests that LLM use does not create additional psychological burden for most learners.

Regarding the effect of LLM use on confidence in foreign language abilities, nearly half of respondents (48%) reported no noticeable change, while 24% experienced increased confidence and 11.7% reported decreased confidence. A substantial minority (16.4%) found the question difficult to answer.

The finding that positive effects on confidence (24%) outweigh negative effects (11.7%) suggests that for some students, LLM support enhances self-assurance in language tasks. However, the predominance of unchanged confidence (48%) indicates that LLMs do not fundamentally alter most students' self-perception of their language abilities. The proportion reporting decreased confidence (11.7%) aligns with research suggesting that over-reliance on AI-generated content may undermine learners' trust in their own language capabilities (Wu, 2024). The significant uncertainty (16.4%) may reflect difficulty in distinguishing between confidence derived from LLM assistance and confidence in one's independent language proficiency.

When asked about emotional dependence on LLMs for language tasks, only 6.4% reported constant dependence, while 46.8% experienced dependence depending on task complexity. Nearly a fifth (18.1%) rarely felt dependent, and 28.7% reported no dependence.

The finding that 53.2% experience at least occasional emotional dependence (6.4% constantly, 46.8% sometimes) indicates that LLMs have become psychologically significant tools for many students, particularly when facing challenging tasks. The task-contingent nature of most reported dependence (46.8%) suggests that students recognise their reliance increases with difficulty level, potentially reflecting reduced confidence in handling complex language tasks independently. However, the substantial proportion reporting rare or no dependence (46.8%) indicates that nearly half of students maintain psychological autonomy from these technologies.

Regarding changes in motivation for independent foreign language learning since beginning LLM use, the majority (52.6%) reported no change. Among those experiencing shifts, motivation increased for 29.2% of respondents (11.1% significantly, 18.1% somewhat), while it decreased for 18.1% (15.8% somewhat, 2.3% significantly).

The finding that positive effects on motivation (29.2%) outweigh negative effects (18.1%) suggests that LLM access may encourage rather than discourage independent learning for some students. However, the predominance of unchanged motivation (52.6%) indicates that LLMs do not fundamentally alter most students' intrinsic drive for language learning. The proportion experiencing decreased motivation (18.1%) aligns with concerns that convenient AI assistance may reduce learners' willingness to engage in effortful independent practice.

When asked about cognitive changes following regular LLM use (with multiple selections permitted), the most frequently reported change was a modified approach to problem-solving

(51.5%), followed by improved critical thinking skills (35.1%) and enhanced understanding of language patterns (28.7%). Over a quarter (26.3%) noticed changes in their writing skills. However, negative cognitive effects were also reported: 24.6% experienced reduced speaking confidence, and 21.1% noted decreased ability to memorise vocabulary and grammar. Notably, 20.4% reported no cognitive changes whatsoever.

The data reveal both benefits and concerns regarding LLMs' cognitive impact. The predominance of problem-solving changes (51.5%) suggests that LLM integration fundamentally alters how students approach language learning challenges, potentially shifting from memorisation-based strategies toward resource-dependent approaches. While some students report improved critical thinking (35.1%) and pattern recognition (28.7%), the substantial proportions experiencing memory decline (21.1%) and reduced speaking confidence (24.6%) align with research concerns that LLM convenience may undermine traditional skill development (Wu, 2024). The finding that one-fifth of users notice no cognitive changes suggests considerable individual variation in how LLM integration affects learning processes.

When asked whether they consider it necessary to indicate LLM use in their academic work, only 8.2% of respondents believed attribution should always be provided, while 40.9% considered it necessary for serious academic work specifically. Over a quarter (27.5%) did not consider attribution necessary, and nearly a quarter (23.4%) found the question difficult to answer.

This distribution reveals considerable uncertainty and divergence regarding ethical LLM use. While 49.1% recognise some obligation to acknowledge AI assistance, the situational nature of most responses (40.9% "for serious academic work") suggests that students apply different ethical standards depending on perceived assignment importance rather than consistent attribution principles. The substantial proportions expressing either outright rejection of attribution requirements (27.5%) or uncertainty (23.4%) indicate that clear institutional guidance on LLM acknowledgment remains inadequate or insufficiently communicated (Kohnke et al., 2023). This ambiguity is particularly concerning given documented concerns about academic dishonesty and plagiarism associated with unattributed AI-generated content (Kohnke et al., 2023).

When asked whether LLM use should be forbidden at universities, an overwhelming majority rejected outright prohibition: only 5.8% supported a ban, while 39.8% opposed restrictions and 54.4% favoured regulation without prohibition.

The finding that 94.2% of respondents oppose complete prohibition indicates widespread recognition that LLMs have become integral to contemporary learning practices. More significantly, the majority preference for regulated use (54.4%) over unrestricted access (39.8%) suggests that students themselves recognise the need for structured frameworks governing AI integration. This pattern aligns with research emphasising that educational institutions must establish clear ethical guidelines and policies for LLM use rather than attempting suppression (Kohnke et al., 2023). The minimal support for prohibition (5.8%) indicates that blanket bans – such as those implemented by some educational systems in response to ChatGPT's release – do not reflect learner perspectives or practical pedagogical needs.

When asked about awareness of university policies on LLM use, 66.1% of respondents indicated familiarity with institutional guidelines, while 33.9% were unaware of such policies.

While two-thirds of students report awareness of university LLM policies, the substantial minority lacking this knowledge (33.9%) is concerning, particularly given the majority preference for regulated rather than unrestricted LLM use (54.4% in Question 15). This gap between students' desire for clear frameworks and actual policy awareness suggests either insufficient communication of existing guidelines or their absence. The finding aligns with

research identifying the need for explicit institutional guidelines and comprehensive communication strategies to ensure students understand expectations for ethical AI use (Barrett, Pack, 2023; Kohnke et al., 2023). The 66.1% awareness rate, while representing a majority, leaves a substantial cohort potentially navigating LLM integration without understanding institutional expectations or ethical boundaries.

5. Conclusions

This study demonstrates that LLMs have become a routine component of foreign language learning for the vast majority of university students surveyed, with 84% actively integrating these tools into their academic practices. While LLMs offer genuine benefits – reducing anxiety, providing accessible support, and facilitating information processing – the findings also reveal concerning patterns: over half of students experience at least occasional emotional dependence on AI verification, a significant proportion report declining memorisation abilities and reduced speaking confidence, and many apply academic integrity standards inconsistently.

The strong preference for efficiency-oriented benefits (70.7%) warrants consideration of the broader context in which this study was conducted. Ukrainian students are currently learning under exceptionally challenging circumstances resulting from Russia's ongoing war of aggression against Ukraine, which has systematically targeted the country's critical and civilian infrastructure, causing widespread power outages and profound daily uncertainty. These conditions may lead students to prioritise tools that help them meet immediate academic requirements over those offering long-term skill optimisation. This pragmatic adaptation suggests that LLM integration patterns cannot be understood separately from the conditions in which learning occurs.

Crucially, students themselves recognise the need for structured frameworks: the majority favour regulated rather than unrestricted use, and many demonstrate awareness of the risks associated with over-reliance on AI. This receptiveness to guidance offers a constructive foundation for pedagogical reform.

Educational institutions must therefore establish clear ethical frameworks and guidelines for AI use, provide comprehensive training on responsible integration, develop assessment methods that distinguish between AI-assisted learning and AI-dependent task completion, and ensure that technology enhances rather than replaces the development of essential language competencies.

References

1. Aljohani, N. J. (2026). *ChatGPT in language learning: A systematic review of applications and challenges*. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 13, 102357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102357>
2. Bagni, M. (2025). *Writing with a Reader in Mind: The Rhetorical Gap Between Genuine EFL Student Essays and LLM-Generated Essays*. *Iperstoria*, 26, 114-140. <https://doi.org/10.13136/2281-4582/2025.i26.1705>
3. Banihashem, S.K., Kerman, N.T., Noroozi, O., Moon, J., Drachsler, H. (2024). *Feedback sources in essay writing: peer-generated or AI-generated feedback?* *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00455-4>

4. Barrett, A., Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to A.I.: student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, 59. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0>
5. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus. (2026). Artificial intelligent. Cambridge Dictionary. Accessed: January 22, 2026. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/artificial-intelligence?q=Artificial+Intelligence>
6. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus. (2026). Large Language Model. Cambridge Dictionary. Accessed: January 22, 2026. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/large-language-model>
7. Copeland, B. J. (2026). Artificial intelligent. Britannica. Accessed: January 22, 2026. <https://www.britannica.com/technology/artificial-intelligence>
8. Dahia, I., Belbacha, M., Yousfi, M. (2026). Reading Reinvented: The Role of LLMs in Developing EFL Students' Reading Skills. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 10(1), 71-83. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.5247>
9. Holmes, W., Tuomi, I. (2022). State of the art and practice in AI in education. *European Journal of Education*, 57(4), 542–570. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12533>
10. Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
11. Kreijkes, P., Kewenig, V., Kuvalja, M., Lee, M., Hofman J. M., Vitello, S., Sellen, A., Rintel, S., Goldstein, D.G., Rothschild, D., Tankelevitch, L., Oates, T. (2026). Effects of LLM use and note-taking on reading comprehension and memory: A randomised experiment in secondary schools. *Computers & Education*, 243 (2026) 105514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2025.105514>
12. Liu, B. (2023). Chinese university students' attitudes and perceptions in learning English using ChatGPT. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 3(2), 132–140. [https://doi.org/10.58557/\(ijeh\).v3i2.145](https://doi.org/10.58557/(ijeh).v3i2.145)
13. Vieriu, A. M., Petrea, G. (2025). The impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on students' academic development. *Education Sciences*, 15(3), 343. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030343>
14. Wale, B. D., Kassahun, Y. F. (2024). The Transformative Power of AI Writing Technologies: Enhancing EFL Writing Instruction through the Integrative Use of Writerly and Google Docs. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2024, 9221377. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/9221377>
15. Wu, Y. (2024). Exploring the influence of large language models (LLMs) on English learners and their teachers. In A. Burns & W. Liu (Eds.), *6th International Conference on Informatization in Education, Management and Business (IEMB 2023)*. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 27, 530–535. <https://doi.org/10.54097/zghke663>
16. Ye, E., Deng, J., Liang, Q., Liu, X. (2022). Using a smartphone-based chatbot in EFL learners' oral tasks. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning*, 14(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJMBL.299405>
17. Zhang, A., Jiang, C. (2026). Beyond grammar checking: the impact of LLM-based instruction on writing strategies for self-regulated learning in EFL contexts. *Cogent Education*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2574333>